



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

July 1897 is mentioned as "a theory which has recently been put forward," without further identification. It is difficult to account for this haphazard method of reference. Often enough Mr. Grundy shows his capacity to learn, if he will, from others. Thus, in the chapter on Salamis he accepts, with ample recognition, Professor Goodwin's view as to the Persian position—that it was outside, not inside the entrance to the strait—and repeats the arguments on which it was based, reinforcing them by observations of his own. He finds it impossible, however, to reconcile this with the account given by Herodotus and offers an ingenious explanation of the latter's mistake; but he neglects to tell us of the manner in which Goodwin so interpreted the crucial passage in Herodotus as to bring it into harmony with the testimony of Æschylus and the nature of the scene of action.

After all that has been said in criticism of Mr. Grundy's method, it is only fair to repeat that large parts of his book possess permanent value. His chapter on Plataea especially will repay careful study. It is to be hoped that he will carry out his purpose to deal in another volume with the remaining campaigns of the fourth century, but no less to be desired that, in expressing his opinion of the strategy of Pericles and the authority of Thucydides, he will not overlook two books which have appeared since his first one was written. One of these is the first volume of Delbrück's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* and the other is the fourth volume of Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums*.

H. A. SILL.

*Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters.* Von JULIUS KAERST. Erster Band. Die Grundlegung des Hellenismus. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1901. Pp. x, 433.)

THE author has for some years been favorably known as a critical student of the sources for the history of Alexander, and his articles in historical and philological periodicals have roused expectation of some such general historical work as that of which the first volume is now before the world. "Ich habe mir die Aufgabe gestellt," he explains in his preface (p. iv), "die Umwandlung des in den engen Grenzen der Polis sich darstellenden Staates in die umfassenden politischen Gestaltungen der hellenistischen Zeit und der in der hellenischen Polis erwachsenen Kultur in die hellenistischen Weltkultur nachzuweisen und das Wesen dieser neuen universalen Bildungen, die treibenden Kräfte, die wichtigsten Entwicklungstendenzen derselben darzulegen."

The first volume is exclusively devoted to the political philosophy of the evolution of Alexander's world-sovereignty. Of the economical, social, artistic and religious aspects of the Hellenistic as contrasted with the Hellenic period, subsequent volumes will doubtless treat. For a history of the period "grossen Stiles," we must still go to Droysen; for detailed pragmatic history, with exhaustive apparatus, to Niese. Of the first predecessor in the field, the author speaks everywhere with due apprecia-

tion ; of the second no mention whatever is made in the preface, and none in the main text of the work. Less than a dozen references to him in the foot-notes are without exception controversial and even deprecatory, though neither in this nor in any other case is the author's controversial procedure virulent or undignified. With Hogarth's recent book the author shows a slight acquaintance, and honors it with a somewhat disdainful reference.

The main tendencies of the work are perfectly clear. Toward our tradition of the histories of Philip and Alexander of Macedon, the author takes a distinctly conservative position, and the kernel of historical truth within the husk of romantic accretion is, as a rule, carefully sought. There is refreshingly little of the arbitrary subjective pronunciamiento so prevalent in much recent work on ancient history among the Germans. Toward the personalities of Philip and Alexander the attitude is consistently favorable, not to say apologetic, and yet admiration and praise are never allowed to escape the most perfect control. Dignity even to heaviness characterizes the whole work ; plan and method are noble and sedate. Military details and attractive anecdotes obscure in wonderfully slight degree the main political thread of the argument. Alexander's siege of Tyre is disposed of in less than two pages ; his capture of the Aornos fastness in a brief sentence, and as a result of this self-control, the conception of the Greek *Polis*, with which the volume opens, is given a truly artistic contrast to that of Alexander's world-swaying personality, with which the volume closes.

The Battle of Chæroneia decided the claims of city-state and monarchical supremacy to the leadership of Hellas. The Athenian city-state, during its leadership, had slowly lost sight of the national, Pan-Hellenic idea, in attempting to satisfy the local and social demands of its sovereign democracy. Sparta and Thebes, during their leaderships, had been unable to triumph over city-state exclusiveness and achieve a general Pan-Hellenic symmarchy. Persia had become the chief power in Hellas. Meanwhile, in spiritual, economical and political life, the technical superiority of the gifted individual was seeking and obtaining scope for itself. The Socratic doctrine of "knowledge" favored the conception and realization of a technically skilled bureaucracy and a technically qualified individual leader of the state. The Macedonian monarchy, as developed by Philip II., and as enlarged by Alexander, furnished both individual leader and trained bureaucracy. Philip II. won for this political system the leadership of Hellas.

The Macedonians were a distinct folk from the Hellenes, but nearly related to them, more nearly than any of their neighbors were, or than they were to any of their neighbors. The royal line were of genuine Macedonian stock. Their pure Hellenic origin was a political fiction of great influence in the Hellenizing process which had been under way long before Philip II., but which was not complete till the time of Perseus. The Macedonian monarchy, with its elastic principles of folk and territorial unity, contrasts fully with the city-state's separation and

exclusiveness. Philip II. based it more broadly than ever on the people, at the expense of the nobility. The vigor of the monarchy in Hellas had been appropriated by laws and constitutions until monarchy had become a mythical memory. But when new intellectual and social currents brought the monarchical ideal again into prominence, lo ! the court of an Archelaüs could attract a Euripides. The monarchical folk of Macedonia had developed a political system which was to wrest to itself the leadership of Hellas and show itself capable of swaying the inhabited world.

Demosthenes was champion of the *Polis*, as a sovereign political system ; Philip of the democratic monarchy. Demosthenes led a pathetic, but not a Pan-Hellenic struggle. The Macedonian monarchy was a better spreader of Hellenic culture than the isolating city-state colonial system ; but the culture was the peculiar product of the city-state principle. The Macedonian Empire at last achieved what Pericles attempted in vain.

Philip's conquest of the leadership of Hellas was primarily in the interests of Macedonia rather than of Hellas ; then such a humiliation of Persia, the deposed Great Power of Hellas, as was consistent with a monarchy based on the Macedonian folk and culminating in the leadership of Hellas, doubtless lay in Philip's plans. Even the retaliatory idea in Persian punishment was not too romantic for a monarch who had posed as a champion of Apollo ! The creation and the development of the Corinthian national Assembly was Philip's greatest Hellenic service. This was an instrument of wonderful scope and power. It marked, not the end of Hellenic freedom, but the consummation of Hellenic unity.

Over against the organic unity of the Macedonian monarchy under Philip is set, by way of contrast, the vast aggregation of the Persian Empire under Darius III., with its disintegrating tendencies in active operation notwithstanding the unifying cruelties of Assyria. From Philip's idea of humiliating this Great Power, and deposing it from supremacy in Hellenic politics by the concerted efforts of all Hellas under Macedonian leadership, Alexander passed by successive steps to the ideas of conquest and sway of the Persian Empire, conquest and sway of the East, conquest and sway of the world. He early freed himself, even at great loss in efficiency, from dependence on the Corinthian Assembly, and therefore from his father's narrower plans, and from exclusively Macedonian policies. His delay in pursuing Darius after the defeat at Issus, in order to conquer Egypt and secure the divine sanction of Ammon, indicates the inception in his mind of the idea of world-empire.

With the defeat of Agis at Megalopolis by Antipater, in 331, the powers and influence of the Corinthian Assembly practically ceased, and, at the death of Darius, Alexander assumed the Persian monarch's heritage. A Macedonian successor of the Achæmenids now exercised their domination in Hellenic matters, but the Macedonian folk-army, the national foundation for the successes of Philip and Alexander, underwent modification. The jealousies and hates arising in the process were curbed with savage and even faithless cruelty. There is ample political

apology for the deaths of Parmenio, Kleitos and Kallisthenes. The heritage of policy from Philip was ruthlessly discarded by Alexander during the very struggles in the heart of Iran (329-327 B. C.) whose success best attests the consummate wisdom and workmanship of Philip. The Macedonian folk-army won their victories only to lose their national monarchy. But Alexander had not deteriorated with his enormous successes—the popular error; he had risen to and adopted a world-policy which demanded the creation by assimilation of a world-folk.

The Indian expedition, long contemplated and prepared, was part of this world-policy, not merely the completion of a task left incomplete by Persia. And it was the physical and moral exhaustion of his new, conglomerate army, not rebellion against his world-policy, which stayed Alexander's progress eastward. He returned to establish a world-capital, to complete and organize his world-empire and above all to make the ocean his vassal and minister. Divine honors for the central and dominating personality in this world-empire were part of his policy, and no confines to that empire except those of the world itself were allowed. Macedonia and Hellas alike were politically sacrificed to this culminating vision of the greatest wielder of the destinies of the ancient world.

Such are the leading thoughts and tendencies of this able book. Following the lead of a seductive political philosophy, and ignoring the exaggerations of romantic tradition, it sets both Philip and Alexander on higher pedestals in the hall of fame than romantic tradition ever claimed for them.

B. PERRIN.

*The Ancient Catholic Church, from the Accession of Trajan to the Fourth General Council (A. D. 98-451).* By ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [The International Theological Library.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. xii, 539.)

THE editors of the "International Theological Library" have entrusted two volumes of the church history in their series to the venerable Dr. Rainy, of Edinburgh, his subject being Catholicism. The first of these lies before us. It comes down to the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. The second volume will cover the period of later catholicism, by which the author understands the history of the Church to Gregory I., or perhaps to Charlemagne, although his plan is to carry the narrative over two or three centuries more,—a "transition period,"—to Hildebrand. We may assume, no doubt, that in the present volume we have the facts which forty years' experience in teaching church history have convinced Dr. Rainy are most important for students of this period to know.

The book is divided into three parts: (1) to the close of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, (2) to the toleration edict of 313, (3) to the Fourth Council. The reasonableness of the first of these epochs is less obvious than that of the second. Why should a church historian select "the accession of Trajan," or of any other emperor to mark a turning point in